

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/607,890	06/30/2000	Klaus T. Reichel	4100-194	1213
. 759	90 07/25/2002			
Thomas C Pontani Esq Cohen Pontani Lieberman & Pavane Suite 1210			EXAMINER	
			WILLIAMS, KEVIN D	
551 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10176			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1,0,1,1,1,1			2854	
			DATE MAILED: 07/25/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/607,890	REICHEL, KLAUS T.
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kevin D. Williams	2854
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 02 July 2002 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this application (1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date o	•	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the d statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	ecause:	
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I	below);	
(c) ☑ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.		•
$3.\square$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	l be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5 and 7-12</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	proved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme		
10. Other:	a	ANDREW H. HIRSHFELD
		RVISORY PATENT EXAMINER CHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

.Continuation She t (PTO-303) 09/607,890,

Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Because of the amendment to claim 1, dependent claims, such as claim 5, comprise scopes not previously presented and therefore raise new issues. Also note that claim 5, as a dependent of claim 1, does not seem to further limit claim 1.